

REMARKS

Claim Rejections

Claims 12-19, 21, and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over Tondreault et al. Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tondreault et al.

It is noted that the reference to Tondreault et al. was initially cited by the Examiner in the outstanding Final Office Action. Thus, this Amendment represents Applicant's initial opportunity to respond to the rejections based upon this reference.

Drawings

it is noted that the drawings were previously accepted by the Examiner as originally filed with this application.

Claim Amendments

By this Amendment, Applicant has canceled claims 14 and 19 and amended claims 12, 15, 17 and 20-22 of this application. It is believed that the amended claims specifically set forth each element of Applicant's invention in full compliance with 35 U.S.C. § 112, and define subject matter that is patentably distinguishable over the cited prior art

The cited reference to Tondreault et al. teaches a cable connector having a cable (12); a plastic housing (14); an array (16) including U-shaped IDC (30) connected to signal wires (32) of the cable and ground contacts (26) connected to drain wires (34) of the cable, and a carrier (18) having barb shaped sections (44) piercing a jacket of the cable to retain the cable.

Tondreault et al. does not teach a connecting part having a protrusion portion engaging said plurality of grounding terminals with said plurality of grounding lines forming an electrical contact (claim 12); nor do Tondreault et al. teach the connection portion having a protrusion portion located on a second end, the protrusion portion being forced and coupled to said plurality of grounding lines forming an electrical contact.

It is axiomatic in U.S. patent law that, in order for a reference to anticipate a claimed structure, it must clearly disclose each and every feature of the claimed structure. Applicant submits that it is abundantly clear, as discussed above, that Tondreault et al. do not disclose each and every feature of Applicant's amended claims and, therefore, could not possibly anticipate these claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102. Absent a specific showing of these features, Tondreault et al. cannot be said to anticipate any of Applicant's amended claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

It is further submitted that Tondreault et al. do not disclose, or suggest any modification of the specifically disclosed structures that would lead one having ordinary skill in the art to arrive at Applicant's claimed structure. Thus, it is not believed that Tondreault et al. render obvious any of Applicant's amended claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Summary

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that this application is now in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested. Should the Examiner not be of the opinion that this case is in condition for allowance, it is requested that this amendment be entered for the purposes of appeal, since it materially reduces the issues on appeal by cancelling claims 14 and 19, thereby rendering moot the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102, and 35 U.S.C. § 103.

Should any points remain in issue, which the Examiner feels could best be resolved by either a personal or a telephone interview, it is urged that Applicant's local attorney be contacted at the exchange listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 23, 2005

By:


Bruce H. Troxell
Reg. No. 26,592

TROXELL LAW OFFICE PLLC
5205 Leesburg Pike, Suite 1404
Falls Church, Virginia 22041
Telephone: 703 575-2711
Telefax: 703 575-2707